(e) if so, from whom; will the Government be pleased to place the said complaint on the Council table ?

Mr. P. V. Raphael.—(a) Yes; there were three attachments.

(b) The decree debts amounted to Rs. 259—12—9 in addition to interest.

(c) The attachment began in Edavam 1106 and was closed in Medam 1107.

(d) No complaint except the attachment orders themselves received from the court.

(e) No answer is necessary in view of the answer to (d) above.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—With regard to answer to (a), may I know from which courts?

Mr. P. V. Raphael.—From the Irinjalakkuda Munsiff Court and the Trichur Munsiff Court.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—(c). Am I to understand that the pay of the Vaidyan was under attachment both in the months of Kumbham and Meenam?

Mr. P. V. Raphael.—It was attached both for Kumbham and Meenam though the attachment has been closed, but subsequently refunded when he got a certificate from the Munsiff that the attachment had closed before that.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—May I know when the attachment was closed?

Mr. P. V. Raphael.—It was closed as is stated here, in Medam.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—It is said that the pay of Kumbham and Meenam had to be refunded. So with the Makaram pay the attachment ceased to exist.

Mr. P. V. Raphael.—That was the real fact, but we got official information only in Medam.

Indebtedness of the Poomangalam Panchayat Vaidyan.

83. Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—Will the Government be pleased to state.—

(a) did the Registrar of Panchayats ever address any Munsiff to supply him with information regarding the indebtedness of the Poomangalam Panchayat Vaidyan ;

(b) if so, when was it done and with what results ;

(c) what were the special reasons for thus ascertaining the extent of the liability of the Vaidyan at that time ;

(d) has the Registrar also ascertained the extent of the indebtedness of other Panchayat Vaidyans and also of the subordinates of his own office ?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. P. V. Raphael—(a). Yes; the Irinjalakkuda, Cranganur and Trichur Munsiffs were addressed in the matter.

(b) It was done in Kumbham and Meenam 1107 when a report regarding the indebtedness of the Vaidyan had to be submitted to the Government. The District Munsiff, Trichur, wrote to say on 24th Kumbham 1107 that the decree debt outstanding against Kuttan Menon came to Rs. 151 and again on 29th Medam 1107 that the attachment had been withdrawn at the instance of the decree-holder. The Cranganur Munsiff wrote to say on 1st Edavam 1107 that no liability was seen pending against the Vaidyan. The Irinjalakkuda Munsiff wrote to say on 25th Kumbham 1107 that decree-debts amounting to Rs. 567—8—5 in all are pending satisfaction against the Vaidyan as below:—

	Rs.	A.	P.
O. S. 653 of 1107	270	2	0
S. C. 982 of 1106	45	7	2
S. C. 23 of 1107	72	11	0
O. S. 715 of 1105	120	8	6
Cranganur S. C. 25 of 1106	31	8	9
S. C. 375 of 1106	27	3	0
Total	567	8	5

(c) The indebtedness of the Vaidyan having come to notice his liabilities so far as could be ascertained had to be found out and reported to Government for orders.

(d) There has been no necessity to do so.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—(b) Was that report submitted on the initiative of the Registrar or were there orders to him to make any such report?

Mr. P. V. Raphael.—There were orders to find out whether the attachments have been cleared by this Vaidyan.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—Was the Registrar responsible for communicating the indebtedness of the Vaidyan to the Government?

Mr. P. V. Raphael.—Yes, I was responsible.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—When was it?

Mr. P. V. Raphael.—It was on 11th Edavam 1107, that I finally made the report to the Government conveying all these things about his decree-debts.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—With regard to the answer to (b), was it on the initiative of the Registrar or were there orders?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. P. V. Raphael.—I submitted that there were orders from the Government to ascertain these and report.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—I want to know when the orders were communicated to the Registrar.

Mr. P. V. Raphael.—The order was dated 7th April 1932 corresponding to 25th Meenam 1107.

Mr. C. A. Ouseph.—May I know whether it is the duty of a Government Officer to report to the Government when chronic indebtedness of his subordinate is brought to his notice?

Mr. P. V. Raphael.—Yes. It enjoins on the Government servants to bring this to the notice of the Government.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—Was any such thing brought to the notice of the Registrar prior to the orders of the Government?

Mr. P. V. Raphael.—The District Munsiff brought to my notice that so many attachments are pending against him.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—May I know whether the sum total of the decree-debts is Rs. 259—12—9?

Mr. P. V. Raphael.—There are other attachment decrees pending against him.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—Were any other debts brought to the notice of the Registrar of Village Panchayats?

Mr. P. V. Raphael.—Yes.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—Which were they?

Mr. P. V. Raphael.—They are all given in answer to (b).

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—That is on the enquiry made by the Registrar, to the various Munsiffs. Prior to that Rs. 259 and odd mentioned in the previous question, was any other debt brought to the notice of the Registrar of Panchayats?

Mr. P. V. Raphael.—No.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—Was any enquiry made with regard to the position in life or the assets of the Vaidyan before this report was made?

Mr. P. V. Raphael.—There was absolutely no need to make an enquiry about his assets.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—Am I to take it that no enquiry was made?

Mr. P. V. Raphael.—No enquiry was made.

Mr. M. Krishna Menon.—Did the Registrar make any enquiry before 3rd Makaram 1107?

Mr. P. V. Raphael.—Yes. In Karkadagam 1106 and all along I have been under correspondence with the Poomangalam Panchayat about this Vaidyan's indebtedness.

Mr. M. Krishna Menon.—With regard to the enquiry reports, did the Registrar make an enquiry in Courts before this Makaram 1107?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. P. V. Raphael.—There was no need because the Court sent me the attachment orders.

Mr. M. Krishna Menon.—On 5th Makaram 1107 did the Registrar get a request to transfer somebody else to this place?

Mr. P. V. Raphael.—It is answered "Yes".

84. **Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.**—Will the Government be pleased to state.—

(a) did the Registrar of Panchayats ever contemplate the transfer of the Poomangalam Panchayat Vaidyan as a remedy for his indebtedness;

(b) if so, when and how did the Registrar think of effecting the remedy by the transfer;

(c) will a copy of his letter dated 3rd Makaram 1107 addressed to the Poomangalam Panchayat be placed on the Council table and also the copy of his letter dated 10th Meenam 1107 to the same Panchayat?

Mr. P. V. Raphael.—(a) No. It was not as a remedy for his indebtedness that his transfer was ordered but in the hope that away from his creditors he would be able to bestow better attention on the ailing public and justify the remuneration he draws.

(b) On 3rd Makaram 1107; vide also (a) above.

(c) Yes; copies are appended (*Appendices II and III*).

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—Was the Vaidyan proposed to be transferred to Thiruwilwamala to the newly started Vaidyasala?

Mr. P. V. Raphael.—Yes.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—Was it because of his experience and standing as a Vaidyan that it was thought necessary to transfer him to Thiruvilwamala to the newly started Vaidyasala?

Mr. P. V. Raphael.—It was also because of that.

President.—It would be quite impossible for the Government to answer if several supplementary questions are put together. Only one Government Member is answering. Therefore the questions may be put separately and definitely.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—Did it strike the Registrar that the transfer of the judgment-debtor from the sphere of his activities would be prejudicial to the interests of the decree-holders concerned?

Mr. P. V. Raphael.—In ordering the transfer I had not the interest of the decree-holders in my mind. I had only the interest of the Vaidyasala.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—Was there any complaint from the ailing public of the locality where this Vaidyan

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly